



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

cannot be maintained as the suit of the corporation: *Stewart & Palmer v. Thornton*, 75 Va. 215; *People v. Fulton*, 11 N. Y. 94.

(b) *In grants, contracts, wills, etc.* Here, if it can be satisfactorily determined by evidence *aliunde* what corporation was intended, the courts will generally give effect to the intention, regardless of the error in the name: 1 Thomp. Corp. 294-5; 1 Morawetz Corp. 354; *Culpeper Soc. v. Digges*, 6 Rand. 165 (18 Am. Dec. 708); *Trustees v. Guthrie*, 86 Va. 125.

CONFUSION OF GOODS BY MUTUAL CONSENT.—This is a frequent case when wheat of many owners is deposited in a mill or a grain-elevator, by way of bailment, with the understanding on the part of all the owners that the grain may be thrown together in a common mass. The law in such a case is that all the owners become tenants in common of the mass. Thus, in *Dale v. Olmstead*, 36 Ill. 150, a case of grain warehousemen, it is said: "The corn of all having been intermingled, according to usage with warehousemen, and without objection of the several owners, it became common property, owned by all in the proportions in which they had contributed to the common stock. This is so from the very necessity of the case, because, so soon as it is intermingled, each person's portion loses its identity, and can no longer be distinguished or separated from the common mass. Neither of the owners could point out, separate, or prove that any particular portion was his. Neither can it be shown when a portion has been lost or appropriated, whose particular corn it was. It being then in common, they are liable to sustain any loss which may occur by diminution, decay or otherwise, in the same proportion."

But, in case of such deposits, an interesting question frequently arises as to the true nature of the transaction, whether, under the circumstances, it may not amount to a sale of the mass of the grain to the miller or other depositary, and so throw the whole loss on him in case of accidental destruction by fire or other cause. In *Reherd v. Clem*, 86 Va. 374, the rule is thus laid down: Where the article delivered is to be returned, though in an altered form (e. g., wheat after it is made into flour), the transaction is a bailment, and the title of the property is unchanged; but where another thing, of equal value, may be returned, the title passes to the receiver, and the transaction is a sale. See, in accord, *Bretz v. Diehl*, 117 Pa. St. 589 (2 Am. St. R. 706); *Barnes v. McCrea*, 75 Iowa, 267 (9 Am. St. Rep. 473). Thus, if the understanding of those who deliver wheat into a mill or elevator is that the person receiving the grain might take from it or the flour at his pleasure, and appropriate the same to his own use, on condition of procuring other wheat or flour to supply its place, the dominion over the property passes to the depositary, and the transaction is sale, not bailment. But although the wheat of many owners is, by their consent, mixed by a miller, yet if his contract is to redeliver to the owners of the mass flour made from that mass, in proportion to their respective interests, with no power to appropriate to himself or to sell to others either the wheat, or the flour made from it, so that all the wheat is to be returned to all the owners as flour, though no owner may get the flour made from his particular wheat, the transaction is a bailment; and if the wheat be destroyed, the loss falls not on the miller, but on the owners of the wheat. See *Slaughter v. Green*, 1 Rand. 3; 2 Schoul. P. P. sec. 46.